

Cowan, Liebowitz & Latman, P.C.

Law Offices

1133 Avenue of the Americas • New York, NY 10036-6799

(212) 790-9200 • www.clm.com • Fax (212) 575-0671

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 11 2005

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner Anand Shashikant Rao / Art Unit 2613	John J. Torrente
COMPANY:	DATE:
United States Patent & Trademark Office	May 11, 2005
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
(703) 872-9306	3
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	B208-837 (25787.890)
RE:	YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER:
Letter Regarding Status of Application	08/682,997

☐ URGENT ☒ FOR REVIEW ☐ PLEASE COMMENT ☐ PLEASE REPLY ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

We are forwarding herewith: Facsimile Transmittal Sheet; Letter Regarding Status of Application; in the application of Motohiro Ishikawa, et al. for IMAGE PICKUP APPARATUS, Serial No. 08/682,997 filed July 18, 1996; in Group 2613.

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Torrente
John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
Attorney for Applicant

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, on: May 11, 2005

John J. Torrente

Signature

May 11, 2005
Date of Signature

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 11 2005

PATENT
B208-837 (25786.890)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants : Motohiro Ishikawa, et al.
Serial No. : 08/682,997
For : IMAGE PICKUP APPARATUS
Filed : July 18, 1996
Examiner : Anand Shashikant Rao
Art Unit : 2613

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

LETTER REGARDING STATUS OF APPLICATION

At the time of filing the Notice of Appeal in the above-identified application, applicants' undersigned attorney advised Examiner Rao that the final Office Action dated September 7, 2005 had an error in that it failed to address newly added claims 43-46. Examiner Rao advised that he would issue a new Office Action which would address all the claims in the application including claims 43-46.

A new final Office Action was issued on March 30, 2005 and the new Action withdrew the finality of the September 7, 2005 Office Action and addressed all the claims in the application including claims 43-46. Upon receipt of the new Action, applicants' undersigned attorney contacted Examiner Rao and Examiner Rao's supervisor, Examiner Kelley, to determine the procedure that should be followed in light of the new Action. Examiner Rao

25786/890/704402.1

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on:

May 11, 2005

John J. Torrente

May 11, 2005
Date of Signature

Signature

confirmed that the new final Action was like any final Action and that the time periods and courses of action that were available were the same. Thus, applicants had the normal three months to respond to the Action, and, at the end of the three-month period, applicants had the usual concurrently running response options, i.e., filing an Amendment, filing a Request for Continued Examination and/or filing a new Notice of Appeal. Also, the usual extensions under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) were available for each. Additionally, if a new Notice of Appeal was filed applicants were advised to request that the fee paid for the original Notice be applied to the new Notice.


The above was also separately confirmed in discussions with the personnel at the USPTO Board of Appeals.

This letter is being sent to set forth our above discussions and understandings regarding the status of the application. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner advise applicants as soon as possible, in the event Examiner has a different understanding.

Dated: May 11, 2005

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y. 10036
(212) 790-9273

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Torrente
Registration No. 26,359
An Attorney of Record